DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 441 792 SP 039 250

AUTHOR Cohen, Myrna D.; Nath, Janice L.
TITLE The Challenge of Impacting Preservice Teachers' Beliefs: A Comparison of Traditional and Field Based Programs.
PUB DATE 2000-04-00
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Change; Attitude Measures; College School Cooperation; *Educational Philosophy; Elementary Education; *Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Professional Development Schools; Program Evaluation; *Student Teacher Attitudes; Student Teachers; Student Teaching
IDENTIFIERS *Field Based Programs

ABSTRACT

This study compared preservice teachers' perceptions of their changing philosophies of education, comparing the reports of graduates from traditional, university-based programs with reports of graduates from intensive field-based programs. For eight semesters, teacher education graduates received a program evaluation survey in the mail 2 weeks after graduation. The survey asked about their educational philosophy, whether it had changed, and why. Data from 428 student responses highlighted seven themes: (1) practitioner concerns of a practical nature; (2) critical/evaluative comments; (3) realization of self-development; (4) education in a broader spectrum; (5) specific agreement with the program; (6) specific disagreement with the program; and (7) vacuous comments. Graduates of the intensive field-based program reported least in the category of personal growth. They did not differ greatly from other students in acknowledging a change in their educational philosophy over the course of the program. Field-based students commented least on agreement with the methods that the program espoused (constructivist and student-centered), although there was higher agreement among them concerning the classroom climate and affect advocated in the program. Field-based graduates were less competent in articulating their philosophies, as they had the highest percentage of vacuous, generic comments. (Contains 3 tables and 10 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 441 792

The Challenge of Impacting Preservice Teachers' Beliefs: A Comparison of Traditional and Field Based Programs

Myrna D. Cohen and Janice L. Nath
University of Houston

Purpose

Understanding and impacting preservice teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning is critical to teacher educators. Our preservice teachers' beliefs about education will eventually affect the decisions they make in their future classrooms. They also will determine the explicit and implicit messages that they eventually convey to their future students (Klein, 1996). Many colleges of education have transitioned to Professional Development School (PDS) formats in their efforts to improve education. Advocates suggest that PDS programs, in addition to producing excellent practitioners, can inspire participants to critically examine their beliefs about teaching and learning. If true, this benefit would give substantial support to the PDS model since school reform cannot be attained without depth of reflection.

This exploratory study describes and compares preservice teachers' perceptions about their changing philosophies of education. Self-reports of graduates of a well-established, intensively field based program were compared to those of two types of traditional university-based programs.

The following questions were addressed: In what ways do preservice teachers perceive that their beliefs about education changed during the course of their teacher preparation program? Are there differences between perceived changes of those participating in a field based program and those participating in a traditional, university-based program? If so, what are the differences between the groups?

We hoped that all of our students would recognize a growing complexity in their philosophies of education and that they would view professional issues more critically. We also hoped that they would be more open to the progressive and constructivist orientations advocated in our program. In addition, we assumed that our students would be capable of articulating their

SP039250

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

beliefs. Although we held these expectations of all of our graduates, we anticipated, based on the framework below, that those in our field based program would show the most development.

Theoretical Framework

Most researchers agree that our education students begin our programs with a well developed conception of schooling based on their many years of experience within the school system (Hollingsworth, 1989; McDiarmid, 1993; O'Laughlin, 1990). Yet there is uncertainty as to how much impact teacher education programs can have on these prior conceptions. McDiarmid (1993) refers to these conceptions as a cohesive web of "remarkable resilience" that is most difficult to change (p.18). Some innovative teacher education programs have admittedly failed to impact the prior beliefs of their students (McDiarmid, 1993; Tillema & Kno, 1997; Zeichner & Liston, 1987). Yet an analysis of these studies and others reveals that researchers have identified factors which may be instrumental in impacting preservice teachers' beliefs as they progress through their teacher education programs. As we developed our intensive field-based teacher education program over the past six years, we have incorporated at least five variables identified by researchers as promising in their power to impact preservice teachers' beliefs. Based on these factors, we hypothesized that the beliefs of our field based program students would be impacted more than those in our traditional program.

One factor relates to school culture. Hollingsworth (1989) for example, questions whether students' field experiences reinforce their prior conceptions of schooling as they are socialized into the status quo. As we built our program we incorporated NCATE's critical attributes for professional development schools (PDS), and in doing so have tried to impact the culture of our schools through our partnerships. In our PDS model, university faculty and classroom teachers work together for change and innovation. We hope that our PDS schools, due to their partnership with our program, are not the status quo, but are places that exemplify the beliefs of our program. As Levine (1997) describes the NCATE criteria, " The teachers/learners cannot blend into a traditional program; they force change, and those changes create the alternative teaching patterns which, in turn, provide the necessary time for peer coaching, and student teacher mentoring" (p. 68). We have tried to be cautious in our selection of PDS sites. Our criteria include schools that enjoy a diverse student population and that can designate a room on their campus for our program. Moreover, we have attempted to choose

schools whose teachers and administration seem open to change and who are eager to collaborate and learn together with us about effective teacher preparation and the learning process. We work with district liaisons who assist us in this selection process. We generally maintain about 23 PDS sites per semester which are located in seven independent school districts in our greater metropolitan area.

A second factor speaks to the conditions necessary to turn conflict into growth. Hollingsworth (1989) discusses the dissonance that some preservice teachers may experience as they compare contrasting views of their various mentors. She suggests that this dissonance may be instrumental for the preservice teachers' growth if they are given the freedom to experiment with their ideas in the field and if they have a support group with whom to discuss their dilemmas. Our program is designed to address both of these criteria as university and school based faculty work intensively with a cohort of preservice teachers in the field. These students enjoy a unique support system, unlike what we can offer those in the traditional model. Our field based program is designed so that two or three PDS sites form a cluster. There are approximately 20 students per cluster. These students are together for all of their methods classes, seminars, and field work. They form a cohesive cohort, sharing academic and interpersonal experiences. Faculty interact with their cluster students beyond the more limited academic plane as they navigate through the many intricacies of the school community. In addition, a teaching assistant, usually a graduate student, is assigned to each cluster. Often students share personal issues with faculty, and perhaps even more so with their teaching assistant.

A third factor concerns the encouragement of critical thinking. McDiarmid (1993) suggests that programs be designed to include critical analysis, peer teaching, role playing, and group discussions in order to combat what Lortie terms "the apprenticeship of observation." Each of these elements is incorporated in our program. In addition, our field work and our course work are tightly integrated.

A fourth factor brings in the power of modeling. Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981) discuss the dangers of universities perpetuating traditional beliefs about education by modeling teacher directed methods in university course work. In our program, innovative methods are implemented in our teacher education classes and in model lessons that our professors teach at our PDS sites. Open inquiry and cooperative learning are espoused in methods courses and are

typically incorporated in our instruction. In addition, we place a heavy emphasis on authentic assessment through portfolio requirements and classroom teaching performance.

A fifth factor suggests the power of experience on impacting beliefs. Brousseau, Book, and Byers (1988) found that "the only variable that shows a significant effect on the vast majority of the beliefs measured was years of experience" (p. 38). In our program, students have more experience in classrooms than in traditional programs as they are in the field for four and a half days each week during their semester prior to student teaching. Our traditional students spend 45 hours in classroom observation during that same semester. Each traditional student is assigned to classroom in any one of the 32 districts that participate in our Teachers Center. These students observe without the support of a cohort.

Program Description

Our teacher education program, PUMA (Pedagogy for Urban and Multicultural Action), provides various tracks for certification in order to meet the needs of our diverse student population. In the fall of 1995, we institutionalized an intensive field based design for all undergraduate students working toward elementary certification. Prior to this date, we had piloted this model for a limited number of volunteer participants. The intensive field based track differs from the traditional ones primarily in the semester prior to student teaching, when the students are pursuing the crux of their professional sequence.

During this semester prior to student teaching, each student in the field based track is placed in one of 23 Professional Development School (PDS) sites in our large metropolitan area. Each site is selected for its multicultural mix of students and its lower socioeconomic conditions coupled with its district reputation for being a school that strives to meet our philosophies about teaching. Two or three PDS sites form a cluster whose students come together each week at one of the school campuses for university courses. The selected elementary schools PDS sites are usually clustered with an intermediate and/or a junior high school, depending on the grade level interests of the students of the PDS cluster each semester. University professors teach the following courses at one of the cluster schools rather than at the university: introduction to teaching seminar, mathematics methods, language arts methods, science methods, and social studies methods. When the preservice teachers are not attending classes, they are placed with a teacher in a classroom for active observation and beginning teaching experiences. This field

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

based commitment is four and one half days a week during this semester for these elementary preservice teachers, during which time they follow a teacher's day. In addition to assignments that require individual classroom interaction with teachers and students, university instructors often schedule classroom demonstrations using pupils of the PDS site. Preservice teachers design and teach an interdisciplinary unit during this time as well. The culminating event is the oral presentation of the portfolio that students have created from their experiences. The audience generally includes their school mentor, instructors, peers, principal, and oftentimes family and friends.

For students in the traditional tracks, the introductory seminar and the methods courses are taught on the university campus. Students individually observe for 45 hours during the semester in a school of their choice, if appropriate. We attempt to place these students in typical urban contexts as well. University instructors do not actively participate in the field experiences of these students, although assignments based on their observations are required. Students generally teach one lesson during this semester in their assigned classroom and turn in a reflective paper based on the experience. They are not observed by a university instructor, although their teacher is encouraged to supply them with constructive feedback. Communication between the university instructors and these teachers is minimal and generally consists only of an introductory letter from the Director of Field Experiences that explains the requirements of the field assignment.

The last semester of each track is student teaching. Students in the intensive field based track can choose to either remain at their PDS for student teaching or to move to another school or district within our Teachers Center. Generally about half of the preservice teachers stay, while the other half request other schools. Those who stay are matched with mentors with whom they worked well during the prior semester. Students in the other tracks request districts and schools, although there is no guarantee their requests will be granted. They generally do not know the mentors to whom they are assigned. During this 14-week semester, student teachers are monitored by a university supervisor and meet once a week for seminars. They gradually take over the teaching and professional requirements of the regular classroom teacher. They may request a 14-week placement or two seven-week placements, depending on their interests and requirements for their particular subject area specialization. A professional portfolio, to be used for interviews, is required at the conclusion of the student teaching experience.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Students in all of our tracks fulfill similar, although not identical, requirements prior to their professional semesters. Required course work for pre-professional development may include technology for teachers, a multicultural course, educational psychology, art for teachers, content area reading, and health for teachers. In addition, preservice teachers may select and begin course work for a specialization within the college such as Early Childhood or Bilingual Education, or they may continue to work on a subject area specialization in another college. The selection process for the final year is rigorous. Students must pass 3 areas of the TASP (Texas Academic Skills Programs) test, they must include references from within the university, and have a overall grade point average that is higher than that of many other colleges within the university. During their final year, students must maintain a 2.5 in their professional development course work and fulfill requirements of a teacher attribute policy (non-instructional related performance issues such as timeliness, responsibility, cooperation, professional demeanor, and so forth). The combination of academics plus professional attributes maintains strong teacher candidates who are ready for the expectations of the work place.

As is evident from the above description, the primary difference between the intensive field based track for undergraduate elementary students and the more traditional tracks for secondary and all level students, is the type of field experience in which they participate. This study compared students from different tracks with different field experiences in terms of their changing beliefs about education.

Methodology

For eight semesters a program evaluation survey, in which anonymity was assured, was sent to graduates of our teacher education program two weeks after graduation. Our of a total of 1,447 surveys sent, 428 surveys were returned during the period from Fall 1994 to Spring 1998 (response rate = 30%). Included in the comprehensive survey were questions regarding educational philosophy. Former students were asked to state whether or not their beliefs about education had changed during the time they were involved in their teacher education program. They were then asked to explain their answers. Because these were anonymous and in open format, and because all had graduated, respondents were not constricted in their answers by either imposed categories or by further university influence. The comments which came first to their minds were those analyzed in this study.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Research involved a two step process. First, after establishing inter-rater reliability, researchers coded all 428 responses, identified themes, and organized the themes into categories according to the procedure suggested by de Vaus (1990). Rather than imposing themes and categories, the researchers allowed them to emerge from the data. Second, data from a sample of field based graduates were compared to two samples of non-field based graduates, following the procedure for non-probablity, purposive sampling as described by de Vaus (1990). Frequency and percentage rankings were calculated for themes and categories for these groups. Sample A were all elementary preservice graduates from a well-establish field based program. Sample B were also at the elementary level, but graduated three years before, when the field based program was still traditional. Sample C graduated the same year as Sample A, but were secondary and all-level preservice graduates who participated in a traditional program.

The primary difference between Sample A and Samples B and C is the nature of the field experience. In Sample A, preservice teachers spent the semester prior to student teaching in their assigned PDS. Their methods courses and their introductory seminar were all taught at the PDS by university faculty. These students spent four and a half days per week at the PDS. When they were not in their methods classes or seminar, they were in childrens' classrooms doing their field work. In contrast, preservice teachers in Samples B and C spent 45 hours observing in public schools in a more traditional manner. They took their methods courses and introductory seminar at the university campus and observed at public schools that were not designated PDS sites. They were not part of a cohort as with Sample A, but rather each preservice teacher conducted his or her field work independently.

Results

After coding the 428 responses, seven overall themes emerged along with 15 categories. The first theme to emerge was Practitioner Concerns of a Practical Nature, encompassing category of Management, Students' Individual Needs, and Methods of Teaching. The second overall theme was Critical/Evaluative Comments (Value of their Experiences in Schools, Criticism of the Educational System, and Disappointment with Teachers). Another overall theme dealt with Realization of Self-Development (Personal Growth, Appreciation of Difficulties and Gratification of the Profession, and New Personal Levels of Tolerance/Understanding). Other overall themes were Education in a Broader Spectrum

(Societal Level), Specific Agreement with the Program (Comments on Affect and Methods), Specific Disagreement with the Program, and finally, a theme was designated for Vacuous Comments.

In comparing the 3 samples, it was evident that the percentage of graduates reporting a change in educational beliefs during their teacher education program from Sample A-Field based (65.1%) was lower than those in Sample B-Elementary Traditional (73.1%) yet higher than those in Sample C- Secondary and All-Level (59.3%) (see Table 1).

Analysis of the open-ended explanations of the change in beliefs of the three samples reveals interesting results (see Table 2). A category of great variance was that of Personal Growth. While only 13.8% of Sample A Field based specifically noted personal growth, higher percentages were shown in the other samples (Sample B-18.4%; Sample C-28.6%). Of the three groups, Sample A-Field -based (6.9%) commented least that they supported methods advocated by the program (Sample B 10.5%; Sample C 7.1%). However, Sample B commented over twice as much (7.9%) as Sample A-Field based (3.4%) that they disagreed with general program philosophy. Another difference was revealed in Vacuous Statements. Sample A-Field based had a greater percentage (17.2%) of vacuous statements than Sample B (2.6%) and Sample C (7.1%). Comments on Management were also different among the samples. A greater percentage of comments were given on Management by Sample C (14.3%) and Sample B (13.2%), while Sample A-Field based contained the least (3.4%). Sample A-Field based (24.1%) discussed the fact that they have a new appreciation for the difficulties involved in the teaching profession. This was much greater than 13.2% from Sample B and 7.1% from Sample C. However, in Sample A-Field based nobody commented on a more positive view of their career choice, whereas those comments appeared in the other two groups (Sample B 7.9% and Sample C 7.1%). Sample A-Field based noted more disappointment with teachers (6.9%) than Samples B (2.6%) and C (0%).

A comparison of the general themes may be less instructive than the more delineated categories, yet the comparison warrants a few comments. For instance, Sample A-Field based paid the lowest attention to practical, practitioner concerns. All three samples had the highest percentage of comments under the general theme of Realization of Self Development, however, that of Sample A-Field based was the lowest of the three. Moreover, Sample A-Field based expressed the highest percentage of vacuous statements as well as the highest percentage of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

critical comments. Finally, although in the comprehensive analysis of all semesters, the theme of Education in a Broader Spectrum emerged, nobody in these three sample groups noted this theme.

Discussion

In several respects the results of this exploratory study were not what we had anticipated. Foremost, we expected graduates of the elementary intensive field based program to achieve the greatest depth of reflection and the greatest development of beliefs. Yet, those same graduates reported least in the category of personal growth. They also did not differ greatly from the other two samples in acknowledging a change in their educational philosophy over the course of the program. In fact, more students in the traditional elementary group noted a change than did those in the intensive program. Secondly, our field based students commented least about agreeing with the methods that our program espouses (consturctivist and student-centered) although there was higher agreement concerning the classroom climate and affect advocated in our program. Third, our field based graduates were also less competent in articulating their philosophies, as they had the highest percentage of vacuous, generic comments.

In trying to understand these results, we wonder if our emphasis on the practicalities of teaching, highlighted by the intensive field based design, was attained at the expense of the academic. In our attempt to bridge theory and practice, perhaps we shortchanged theory. Our intent was to structure a PDS model in which the academic was strengthened by the practical, not one in which the academic was sacrificed. Furthermore, our incorporation of authentic assessment may have contributed to our students' lack of ability to articulate their beliefs. We did not administer written exams nor require academic papers on theoretical topics in the field based program as we did in the more traditional ones. Our students apparently excel on performance assessment and portfolio presentations, but not on more traditional written assessments where they are required to verbalize ideas. Another interpretation could be related to cognitive dissonance. We may be eliminating dissonance as we strive to align the philosophy of our PDSs and that of the university. Ironically, this could be disadvantageous as working through dissonance may stimulate growth (Hollingsworth, 1989). Another more optimistic interpretation to the disappointing notation of change in beliefs, could be that the students in the field based group began our program with views similar to our own. The field based group

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

started our program three years later than the other elementary group. Perhaps progressive ideas about education were more prevalent and accepted at this later date. However, the secondary and all level students who also reported less philosophical change, started our program the same year as the field based group, weakening this interpretation.

Our PDS students had much more practical experience than their cohorts, yet they addressed practical concepts such as management and methods the least. Perhaps intensive field-basing acquainted them well with the practitioner side of teaching, making it less of a concern for them. Although management is often cited as the major concern of beginning teachers, the field based group did not find it noteworthy. Perhaps their extensive classroom experience raised their comfort level sufficiently. It is a promising finding if it implies that field based programs can redirect energies from practical issues to critical thinking about education.

Our field based graduates also differed from their cohorts in that they expressed a new awareness of the difficulties of teaching. This may imply that the field based graduates' intense immersion into the everyday practicalities of teaching gave them a more realistic picture of the responsibilities of the classroom teacher. It seems contradictory that these same students commented most on their disappointment with teachers. We would assume that they would have developed the most empathy for teachers since they spent more time with their mentors than did the other students.

Implications

We acknowledge that our study has limitations. The results rely on self reports and on recollection about what beliefs were two years prior to data collection. Also, only responses of volunteers were included. Yet although we recognize that this study is exploratory and that our findings require further investigation, the results have caused us to rethink important aspects of our program and to institute changes. We have modified our portfolio requirements in several ways and have redesigned our delivery schedule. We have also altered our PDS selection process.

The oral and written portfolio at the time of data collection was a true portfolio in the sense that the preservice teachers made their own collection and organizational decisions. Often they would present a true working portfolio in which they had a considerable amount of files and materials ready to begin a teaching year. This was one of our original rationales for the

portfolio. However, the lack of reflection of our field based students revealed in this study caused us to wonder whether these students were simple collecting everything they could to have their portfolio appear larger, despite our direction to the contrary. Our concern was that they were concerned with quantity rather than quality. We could see the pathway from where this originated. At the onset of this program, very conscientious preservice teachers who received top scores on their portfolios presented several crates of materials in a very professional manner. Those preservice teachers who did not attend the oral presentations, but only saw the quantity of the product were mislead. Their emphasis subsequently became the collection of massive amounts of materials, with little thought as to why they would include it, again, despite instructions given by instructors to the contrary. This trend coupled with our state's growing accountability demands for higher accreditation test scores, led us to reconsider the direction of the portfolio.

First, we decided to have preservice students organize their portfolio into 15 areas, one for each competency developed by the state in professional development. For each, the preservice teacher was to: (1) collect information on the topics presented in the competency, (2) show evidence of application of the principles found in the competency in some way, and (3) reflect upon the application based on the principles. The manner in which they completed these requirements was left completely to each preservice teacher. Interestingly enough, we noticed that those students about whom we were worried during the course of the semester now no longer arrived with massive amounts of materials thrown together, but a very small notebook with only a minimum amount of information, while the quality of their oral presentation changed little. We were not yet satisfied. The next step was to introduce a question sheet to incorporate for each competency (see Appendix). Preservice teachers still selected their own evidence. To our satisfaction, the professionalism of the written and oral presentations increased markedly for preservice teachers in this more directed portfolio.

However, the massive amount of written work required to get this format in order was overwhelming at a time when our emphasis was also on beginning teaching experiences. This past year we have experimented with cooperative group presentations. A small group (based on school placement) selects from their own personal evidences the best from each member to complete one portfolio. The entire group presents this portfolio orally. We are excited about the first year's results, as we are finding that the associated conversation is professionally oriented

and provides preservice teachers with an opportunity to test their beliefs often in the communication process.

Another area of change was to 'front-load' our schedule for teaching. The university instructors now have two weeks on the university campus with their students prior to moving to the PDS site. This was designed to allow for use of technology labs, science labs, etc., that may not be available in the field. In the past, instructors had only met with preservice teachers for two sessions during these two weeks for their regularly scheduled class time, and preservice teachers were free for the remaining two and one half days during these two weeks. However, that often was not seen as enough time to introduce preservice teacher to the professionalism issues of entering a school system. Therefore, generic teaching instructors in particular began to 'front load' their class periods, filling preservice teachers' free time during the first two weeks with classes. This allowed instructors to cover numerous issues prior to entering the PDS site. This effort has been of benefit in several ways. First, preservice teachers are really ready to enter a school professionally with concern to teacher attribute-type behaviors. Then, instructors have more time later in the semester to spend on observations and issues that arise from the site. Finally, preservice teachers have more time to spend on conceptualizing our philosophies prior to seeing others that may exist in the schools. For example, during the spring semester in this state, many schools teach only state testing materials, often in worksheet format. If we have no time to counteract this, our students may think that we agree with this type of teaching.

We have also reflected upon the manner by which we select our PDS sites. During this data collection period we relied heavily on our partner districts to help select school sites that agreed with our philosophies. However, we believe that occasionally, though certainly not often, the district would aim us in a direction that served their needs more than those of our preservice teachers. When that happened, teachers in the schools often were subjected to top-down decisions and were not as professional as in sites that truly matched our beliefs. Therefore, we began a new process of site selection based upon obtaining full school cooperation. Each of our partner districts advertise for needed PDS sites. When schools respond, the district narrows the choice to several that match our needs (specifically for lower SES, multicultural, and good teaching). Then, a team from the university goes to a school meeting, attended by ALL members of the school, and presents our program to them. Upon leaving, we ask them all to consider this carefully, as success depends on each and every member's commitment to be a teacher educator.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

After we leave, a vote is taken. This process seems, overall, to be working quite positively, as there seems to be a greater ownership in the program.

As we continue to evaluate and fine tune our program, we are encouraged by recent comments of our most recent graduates, some of which are presented below:

> "I originally thought it was my job as a teacher to 'control' the students – a very authoritative approach. I now see my style becoming more student centered – allowing the student to think and discover more. I see the value of cooperative work among students."
>
> "I realized that you need both college education classes AND being in the classroom to be an effective teacher. When I first started, I though I could jut go into the classroom. I was wrong."
>
> "I know an extensive amount more about teaching, managing, and planning. Experience has taught mw patience, understanding, and responsibility. Teaching has opened my eyes wider to see beyond lecture style teaching."
>
> "As I got the chance to remove myself from course work at the university and apply knowledge to tutor and teaching projects, my philosophy began to shift to focus on student priorities instead of my own ideals."

References

Brousseau, B. A., Book, C., & Byers, J. (1998). Teacher beliefs and the cultures of teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 39 (6),* 33-39.

De Vaus, D. A. (1990). *Surveys in Social Research.* London, UK: Unwin Hyman Inc.

Hollingsworth, S. (1989). Prior beliefs and cognitive change in learning to teach. *American Educational Research Journal, 26 (2),* 160-189.

Klein, P. D. (1996). Preservice teachers' beliefs about learning and knowledge. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research 42 (4),* 361-377.

Levine, M. (1997). Can professional development schools help us achieve what matters most? *Action in Teacher Education, 19 (2),* 63-73.

McDiarmid, G. W. (1990). Challenging prospective teachers' beliefs during early field experience: A quixotic undertaking? *Journal of Teacher Education, 41 (3),* 12-20.

O'Loughlin, M. (1990). Evolving beliefs about teaching and learning. The view from Hofstra University: A perspective on teachers' beliefs and their effects. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED327 478).

Tillema H. H. & Knol W. E. (1997). Promoting student teacher learning through conceptual change or direct instruction. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 13 (6),* 579-595.

Zeichner, K. M. & Liston, D. P. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. *Harvard Educational Review, 57,* 23-48.

Zeichner, K. M. & Tabachnick, B. R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education 'washed out' by school experience? *Journal of Teacher Education, 32,* 7-11.

Table 1
Percentages Responding to the Question about Perceived Philosophy Change

Has Philosophy Changed?	Group A-Elementary Field Based (n=59)	Group B-Elementary Traditional (n=77)	Group C-Secondary and All Level traditional (n=28)
Yes	65.1	73.1	59.3
No	34.9	26.9	40.7

Table 2
Percentages Identifying Each Category

Category	Group A-Elementary Field Based (n=59)	Group B-Elementary Traditional (n=77)	Group C-Secondary and All Level Traditional (n=28)
1. Gained new appreciation, more difficult than once thought	24.1	13.2	7.1
2. Gained new appreciation, now more positive	0	7.9	7.1
3. Management	3.4	13.2	14.3
4. More awareness of individual student needs	6.9	7.9	0
5. Feel personal growth	13.8	18.4	28.0
6. Valuing practical experience in schools	0	5.3	0
7. Rejecting program philosophy	3.4	7.9	0
8. Critical of system	3.4	2.6	7.1
9. Agreeing with methods espoused in program	6.9	10.5	7.1
10. Awareness of important factors outside of school	0	0	0
11. Disappointed in teachers	6.9	2.6	0
12. See importance of affect	6.9	2.6	7.1
13. Feeling more tolerant and understanding	3.4	2.6	14.3
14. More awareness of low standards	3.4	0	0
15. Empty statements	17.2	2.6	7.1

Table 3
Percentages Identifying Each Theme

Main Theme	Group A- Elementary Field Based (n=59)	Group B- Elementary Traditional (n=77)	Group C – Secondary and All Level Traditional (n=28)
Practitioner Concerns of a Practical Nature	10.3	21.1	14.3
Critical, Evaluative Comments	13.7	10.5	7.1
Realization of Self Development	41.3	42.1	56.5
Education in a Broader Spectrum	0	0	0
Specific Agreement with Program	13.8	13.1	14.2
Specific Disagreement with Program	3.4	7.9	0
Vacuous Comments	17.2	2.6	7.1

Appendix

1. What evidence(s) have you chosen for this competency?
2. What is the theoretical basis of this evidence? (Provide a theoretical rationale for this evidence.)
3. How does this evidence reflect mastery for this particular state criteria?
4. Why do you think that this criteria was included in the state requirements?
5. From where and how did this evidence originate?
6. What did you know about this area prior to entering the PUMA program? How does this evidence for the criteria reflect upon your growth in performance this semester as a teacher?
7. Reflect on the changes you would make in this evidence if you could do this over again?
8. Over time, how do you think you will feel about your stance on this area/competency and the evidence you have submitted?
9. What other pieces of evidence did you note in your selection of this criteria and why did this particular piece stand out as a good example for presentation?
10. How did your experience in the classroom (with your SBTE/mentor teacher) this semester contribute to strengthening this criteria? What did your SBTE and school think about this criteria? What evidence led you to believe that they thought this way?
11. How did your professors/reading/assignments this semester contribute to strengthening your skills and knowledge about this criteria?
12. How will this criteria impact you practically on a daily basis in the classroom?
13. Based on your understanding of this criteria,write an ExCET question for this criteria, including the correct answer and detractors.
14. What general comments /reflections do you have about the whole competency?
15. State your personal philosophy on this criteria now.

Overall Portfolio

1. What is the strongest of your 15 criteria? Why?
2. What is the weakest of your 15 criteria? Why?
3. What will you do to strengthen the weak categories prior to taking the ExCET test and to student teaching? What will you do during student teaching to strengthen these categories prior to accepting a teaching position?
4. If you were able to begin your portfolio again, how would you change the process? the products? the reflections?
5. What is the most/least important of the criteria to you as an instructor? Why?
6. What is the most/least important of the criteria to you personally? Why?
7. What is the most/least practical of the criteria to you? Why?
8. What important theoretical areas became fixed in your mind as a result of working with these ExCET criteria?
9. Of what in your portfolio are most proud?
10. How did each of the criteria in this portfolio help to make you an educator rather than only a deliverer of instruction?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE